<u>REMARKS</u>

Claims 1-4, 6-24 and 26-32 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7-9, 11-13 and 18-22 have been amended as shown on pp. 2-7 of the Reply. Additionally, claim 31 has been cancelled and claims 33 and 34 have been added. Applicant's representative contends the amendments put the application in better condition for allowance or appeal and that no new search is necessitated by the amendments. Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I.   Rejection of Claim 31 Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claim 31 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 31 has been cancelled herein and, therefore, this rejection should be withdrawn.

II.   Rejection of Claims 1-4, 6-24 and 26-32 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-4, 6-24 and 26-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Maislin (U.S. 2002/0120712). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Maislin does not disclose, teach or suggest each and every limitation of the subject claims.

> For a prior art reference to anticipate, 35 U.S.C. §102 requires that *"**each and every element** as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." In re Robertson*, 169 F.3d 743, 745, 49 USPQ2d 1949, 1950 (Fed. Cir. 1999) (*quoting Verdegaal Bros., Inc. v. Union Oil Co.*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)) (emphasis added).

The subject invention relates to systems and methods that facilitate automated discovery of information. A software developer can discover and interpret technology-specific and programming-language-specific functionality utilizing natural and professional languages that may be independent of that employed by the author of the associated technical documentation describing such functionality.

Independent claim 1 recites a system that facilitates finding documentation comprising a query component that receives a request for technical documentation, the request comprising terminology of a first vocabulary corresponding to a first programming language, a mapping component that *correlates terminology of the first vocabulary to semantically equivalent terminology of a second vocabulary related to a second programming language* and a discovery component that *retrieves technical documentation based upon the the terminology of the second vocabulary that is semantically equivalent to the terminology of the first vocabulary employed in the request*. Maislin does not disclose, teach or suggest such novel aspects.

Rather, Maislin relates to determining relationships between two different subjects and providing information regarding a second subject in addition to a first subject when a user searches for the first subject. (*See* paragraphs 3 and 23-25). A relationship is formed by statistical evidence tending to show that a user searching for a first subject may likely search later for a second subject. (*See* paragraphs 5 and 19). Thus, while Maislin discloses providing an efficient search system tracking historical search data to determine a statistical correlation between the searched subject and a subject a user may later request, the correlation is employed to provide additional information on a second subject not requested by a user and not to retrieve technical documents in a second vocabulary requested by the users employing a first vocabulary as recited by the claimed invention. For example, Maislin discloses that a user searching for "apartments" may also be presented with information regarding real estate because of a historical likelihood that a user looking to rent may also be interesting in buying. (*See* paragraphs 19 and 26). However, in the claimed invention when applied to the Maislin example, a user searching for "apartments" may be presented with information regarding "units", "suites", "lofts", "studios", "efficiencies", "penthouses" or any other term that a landlord may employ to describe his premises. Maislin provides a user with information on a *different* subject but the claimed invention provides the user technical documentation based upon the second vocabulary and semantically equivalent to the first vocabulary employed in the request. Therefore, Maislin does not disclose each and every limitation recited by independent claim 1.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that Maislin does not anticipate independent claims 23, 24, 31 and 32. Independent claim 24 (and similarly independent claims 24, 31 and 32) recites a computer-based information retrieval system comprising means for creating an object associated with developer terms or phrases learned from past user searching patterns means for

correlating the object with alternative terms or phrases means for ***retrieving functional
information equivalent to the developer terms and phrases in accordance with the alternative
terms or phrases***. Maislin does not disclose, teach or suggest each and every limitation of the
subject claims.

As discussed *supra*, Maislin relates to providing a user searching for information on a
first topic with information on a second different topic based upon historical evidence that the
user may also search for the second topic after searching for the first topic. For example, Maislin
discloses that a user searching for "real estate" will also be presented with information regarding
furniture because of a pre-determined likelihood that users looking to buy a new home will also
look to furnish the new home. (*See* paragraph 19). In the claimed invention, alternative terms or
phrases are correlated with terms and phrases employed by the user and information is provided
to the user that is based upon the alternative terms or phrases but equivalent to the terms or
phrases utilized by the user. In the claimed invention, a user searching for "functions invoked at
runtime" would also be presented with functionally equivalent information employing alternative
terms such as "late-bound calls." Thus, Maislin discloses providing information on a second
subject along with information on a first searched subject and is silent regarding *retrieving
functional information equivalent to the developer terms and phrases in accordance with the
alternative terms or phrases* as recited by the subject claims. Therefore, Maislin fails to disclose
each and every limitation recited by independent claims 23, 24, 31 and 32.

In view of at least the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that Maislin does not
disclose, teach or suggest applicant's claimed invention as recited in independent claims 1, 23,
24, 31 and 32 (and the subsequent dependent claims which depend there from). Accordingly,
this rejection should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP491US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/
Himanshu S. Amin
Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731